

**REMARKS:**

The present amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance the prosecution of the case and, in the event that the application is currently not in condition for allowance, to place the case in better form for appeal.

1. The objections to the specification have been removed by appropriate amendment. No new matter has been introduced and applicants do appreciate the fact that the Examiner has pointed out the informalities to the undersigned.

2. Applicants also appreciate the fact that all of the claims appear to be free from any grounds of rejection under 35 USC 112. A complete set of claims is presented as the rules require and claims 32 and 40 have been amended.

3. Amended claim 32 is deemed to define invention over HASLOP et al as applied under 35 USC 103, taken alone or in combination with MARKANTES et al and over the other combinations of references and the remaining claims in the case are likewise deemed to define invention.

The Examiner has suggested that if one wanted to be a little less complicated one could remove the HASLOP's "more professional viewing method" and adopt applicants' "primitive direct viewing" and thereby reach applicants' invention. Or the Examiner

could use the MARKANTES et al technique to provide an observation window for direct observation.

These remarks appear to show that the Examiner may have missed the point.

First of all, applicants are not the least bit intending to look at the tail on the sheet which is inspected, for specific ultraviolet radiation effects or fluorescence generally. They are not concerned by the reflectance or the fluorescence but rather the scattering behavior of a document having light-scattering properties.

They monitor such behavior in a unique way since they direct parallel but separate light beams at a predetermined general angle onto the measuring window but with a difference for the individual light beams which can range from  $\pm 10^\circ$ . They then collect all of the light beams outputted from a point at the different angles in a common window so that the eye can ascertain immediately the scattering pattern. The result is an ability to quickly and practically instantaneously determine whether the document is true or counterfeit.

In MARKANTES et al the viewing is intended of a specific image rather than the angle-dependent scattering behavior of a document, and thus there is nothing in MARKANTES et al which would

suggest that if one wanted to determine the angle-dependent scattering behavior of a document, one should replace the HASLOP et al "more professional" viewing method by the MARKANTES et al viewer. In fact there is nothing in HASLOP et al either which would suggest that the combination could or should be made. In fact, all of the Examiner's observations as to how HASLOP should be treated by one of ordinary skill in the art and how MARKANTES et al should be treated by one of ordinary skill in the art is nothing more than the hindsight application of applicants' discovery here to those references.

HASLOP et al and MARKANTES et al do not carry out the visual verification of angle-dependent scattering from a document having light-scattering processes and do not provide a light feed trained onto the measuring window from parallel but separate light beams with the spread as defined in claim 32 to display a plurality of light beams scattered from a point in that window to the eye of the observer.

The BALTES et al reference uses an interferometric method to process the output and again is intended at looking to interferometry-related phases but not differently-scattered outputs at different angles, so that here too it is not to be obvious to discard the essence of the BALTES structure to obtain the claimed system.


The STEIN window evaluates eh luminescent characteristics of the product evaluated.

Thus while the references disclose light beams of all kinds and analyses of all kinds, they do not show or suggest, taken individually or in combination, the plurality of separate incident light beams as claim and the capture of a plurality of light beams outputted from a scattering point at different angles as claimed.

Claims 32 and the claims dependent thereon are therefore allowable and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

4. A petition for a one-month extension of the term is enclosed together with a charge form covering the fee.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



---

By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752  
Attorney for Applicants

ef-

12 April 2004

5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900

Bronx, NY 10471-0900

Cust. No.: 535

Tel: (718) 884-6600

Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosures: Substitute rewritten pgs. of spec.

Marked-up pages of rewritten spec.

Extension of term

Charge form for extension fee.